



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,759	10/08/2003	Robert Anthony DeLine	MS304376.1	8309

27195 7590 06/05/2008
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

YIGDALL, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/05/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/681,759	Applicant(s) DELINE ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael J. Yigdal	Art Unit 2192	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-20 and 22-24.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Tuan Q. Dam/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192

Continuation of 3.

Applicant states that the proposed amendments to the claims incorporate limitations that were previously presented in independent claim 24 (remarks, page 7). Nonetheless, independent claim 24 stands finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The proposed amendments do not materially reduce or simplify the issues for appeal.

Continuation of 11.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that Necula does not teach or suggest "performing a component-wise comparison of a user injected custom state and a state defined by a parameter to determine a fault condition" (remarks, page 7).

However, the rejection of independent claim 24 is based on a combination of Necula and Hallem. As set forth in the final Office action, the Hallem reference provides "performing a component-wise comparison of a user injected custom state and a state defined by a parameter to determine a fault condition."

Applicant further contends that Hallem does not teach or suggest "performing a component-wise comparison of a user injected custom state and a state defined by a parameter to determine a fault condition" (remarks, page 9).

However, Applicant's contention amounts to a general allegation without analysis of the examiner's reasoning. As set forth in the final Office action (see page 17):

Hallem teaches static analysis of code (see, for example, page 69, Abstract). Hallem further teaches passing user-injected custom state values to extensions or plug-in conditions that define state machines (see, for example, page 70, section 2.1, Metal Extensions and State Machines, first, second and third paragraphs) to check for bugs and fault conditions (see, for example, page 69, Introduction, second paragraph). The teachings of Hallem provide flexibility and ease of use in arbitrarily extending the checker (see, for example, page 69, Introduction, third paragraph). One of ordinary skill in the art could, with predictable results, implement the teachings of Necula so as to perform component-wise comparison of a user injected custom state and a state defined by the parameter to determine a fault condition. As Hallem describes, such an implementation would provide flexibility and ease of use in arbitrarily extending the checker of Necula. Thus, the claimed subject matter would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

The examiner respectfully reminds Applicant that the test for obviousness is not that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). The examiner submits that a prima facie case of obviousness has been established.

/MY/